



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,075	09/27/2001	Richard G. Hartmann	END920010023US1	3378

7590

01/27/2006

IBM Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law (Dept. 917, Bldg. 006-1)  
3605 Highway 52 North  
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/965,075	HARTMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dustin Nguyen	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 27 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- A. The following terms lack antecedent basis:

- I. workstation - claims 1, 7, 11.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 9-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroll et al. [ US Patent No 5,159,684 ], in view of Bass et al. [ US Patent No 6,076,081 ].

6. As per claim 1, Kroll discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method for character interactive input/output in a half duplex block mode environment including a client workstation and a server, comprising the steps of:

automatically transferring said keystroke from said workstation over a ½ duplex block mode interface to a full duplex character interactive input/output server application [ i.e. Echoplex mode to RS-232 mode ] [ col 1, lines 42-52; and col 5, lines 37-47 ]; and

said full duplex character interaction input/output server application processing said keystroke and responding appropriate to context of said full duplex character interaction server application [ i.e. communicate with RS 232 devices or applications ] [ col 2, lines 6-11; and col 13, lines 27-col 14, lines 3 ];

thereby transferring single key strokes as they are entered at said client workstation even though operating in said half duplex block mode environment in which character sequences are normally transferred [ col 1, lines 47-52; and col 11, lines 5-35 ].

Kroll does not specifically disclose

receiving a key stroke into a buffer at said workstation.

Bass discloses

receiving a key stroke into a buffer at said workstation [ i.e. enter at the keyboard ] [ 18, Figure 1; and col 4, lines 13-16 ].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Beardsley and Angelo because Angelo's teaching of buffering keystroke would allow to control and manipulate input information.

7. As per claim 2, Kroll discloses said buffer being an auto enter, non-display entity on a display screen [ col 9, lines 24-29 and lines 35-38 ].

8. As per claim 3, Kroll discloses said buffer being a non-screen entity accessible to said client workstation [ col 16, lines 35-39 ].

9. As per claim 4, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 2. Furthermore, Kroll discloses defining a workstation display as a 1-byte character input field [ i.e. a byte or 8-bits ] [ col 1, lines 59-62 ].

10. As per claim 5, Kroll discloses communicating an attention signal from said client workstation; responsive to said attention signal, communicating said keystroke from said workstation display to said server application [ col 1, lines 56-58 ].

11. As per claim 6, Kroll does not specifically disclose client workstation and server together becoming a cascaded client to a targeted application server that requires character dependent input/output in full duplex mode. Bass discloses client workstation and server together becoming a cascaded client to a targeted application server that requires character dependent input/output in full duplex mode [ Figure 1; and col 4, lines 35-44 ]. It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2154

12. As per claim 7, Kroll discloses the step preventing display of said input character on said workstation display [ i.e. non-echo ] [ title, and Abstract ].

13. As per claims 9 and 10, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4 and 5.

14. As per claim 11, Kroll discloses returning from said remote application to said client workstation a display character for display at said workstation display [ col 3, lines 15-17 ].

15. As per claim 12, Kroll discloses an echo character which may be said input character [ col 3, lines 13-17 ].

16. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4 and 5.

17. As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.

18. As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 12.

19. As per claims 16-25, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-12.

Art Unit: 2154

20. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroll et al. [ US Patent No 5,159,684 ], in view of Bass et al. [ US Patent No 6,076,081 ], and further in view of Busey et al. [ US Patent No 5,764,916 ].

21. As per claim 26, Kroll and Bass do not specifically disclose transferring said key stroke from said client workstation to a telnet client and thence to said full duplex character interactive server application via a Unix server. Busey discloses transferring said key stroke from said client workstation to a telnet client and thence to said full duplex character interactive server application via a Unix server [ col 3, lines 36-58 ]. It would have been obvious

22. As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 26.

23. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroll et al. [ US Patent No 5,159,684 ], in view of Bass et al. [ US Patent No 6,076,081 ], and further in view of Shoquist et al. [ US Patent No 5,361,199 ].

24. As per claim 8, Kroll and Bass do not specifically disclose the step of operating said client and providing for translation of said character from EBCDIC to ASCII. Shoquist discloses the step of operating said client and providing for translation of said character from EBCDIC to ASCII [ col 11, lines 13-20 ]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kroll, Bass and Shoquist

Art Unit: 2154

because Shoquist's teaching of character translation would provide device from multiple platforms to efficiently communication with each other without any errors.

25. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

26. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

### ***Conclusion***



Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
Art Unit 2154  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100